

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/650,497	08/28/2003	Paul A. Blowers	P0011281.00/LG10126	6963
27581 MEDTRONIC	7590 12/22/2019 TNC	EXAMINER		
710 MEDTRO	NIC PARKWAY NE	REYES, REGINALD R		
MINNEAPOL	IS, MN 55432-9924		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		3626		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/22/2010	ELECTRONIC .

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

rs.docketingus@medtronic.com sso@cardinal-ip.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Ī	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/650,497	BLOWERS ET AL.				
	Examiner	Art Unit				
	REGINALD REYES	3626				

	REGINALD REYES	3626							
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress						
THE REPLY FILED 13 December 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	THE REPLY FILED 13 December 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:									
a) The period for reply expires months from the mailing	date of the final rejection.								
(i) The period for reply express on: (i) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply express later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: (bbx s) is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TW.									
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)		THO THE ET WAS IN	LLD WITHIN TWO						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above; if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filled, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL									
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR.41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filled within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(e).									
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>									
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> </ol>	sideration and/or search (see NOT		cause						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying ti	ne issues for						
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.							
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).									
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).						
<ol><li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li></ol>									
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		be entered and an e	xplanation of						
Claim(s) objected to:									
Claim(s) rejected: 1. 3-11. 13-22. 24-29. 31-36. 38-43. 45- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	<u>47</u> .								
The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	hefore or on the date of filing a No	ntice of Anneal will not	he entered						
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).									
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	l and/or appellant fail: ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a ).						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.						
11. \( \begin{align*}\) The request for reconsideration has been considered but the applicant arques that the referees fail to provide any disagree. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary teachings of Rueter, Hatlestad and Duffin. The well know the combination, each element merely would have perfor the art would have recognized that the results of the combination.	suugetion that would have rendere skill in the art at the time the inven in elements described are merely a med the same function as it did se bination were predictable	ed it obvious examiner tion was made to com a combination of old e	respectfully bine the lements, and in						
<ol> <li>Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (</li> </ol>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)								
13. Other:									

/C. Luke Gilligan/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3626

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Part of Paper No. 20101217